

Application No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Docket No.: 65783-0009

SEP 27 2006

### REMARKS

This response is intended to be fully responsive to the non-final Office Action ("Office Action") having a mailing date of March 31, 2006, wherein claims 1-5, 7-29 and 31-48 were rejected. Claims 6 and 30 were objected to.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 24, 31, 32, 37, 38, 39, 42, 44, 45, 47, and 48. Claims 6, 19, 30, 33, 35, 41, 43 and 46 are cancelled. Claims 49 and 50 are new. Support for the amendments is found at least in paragraphs [0031]-[0032], [0063]-[0064], and [0086], and FIGS. 1-4. By way of this amendment, no new matter has been added.

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action and thank the Examiner for the detailed review of the pending claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

#### A. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6 and 30 were objected to by the Examiner and were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have added new claims 49 and 50, based on claims 6 and 30 respectively, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowable subject matter.

#### B. Summary of Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,130,792 to Tindell et al. ("Tindell").

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tindell in view of U.S. Patent 5,973,722 to Wakai et al. ("Wakai").

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tindell in view of U.S. Patent 6,263,503 to Margulis.

Claims 1, 5, 24-26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,973,663 to Brown et al. ("Brown") in view of Tindell.

Claims 7, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis in view of U.S. Patent 6,370,322 to Horiguchi et al. ("Horiguchi").

Application No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006

Docket No.: 65783-0009

Claims 31, 32, 34, 36, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis in view of Horiguchi and further in view of Tindell.

Claims 33 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis in view of Horiguchi and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,611,537 to Edens et al. ("Edens").

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Margulis in view of Horiguchi further in view of Tindell further in view of U.S. Patent 6,603,488 to Humpleman et al. ("Humpleman").

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Margulis in view of Horiguchi further in view of Edens.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis in view of Horiguchi further in view of Wakai.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis in view of Horiguchi further in view of Brown further in view of Tindell.

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,246,933 to Bague in view of U.S. Patent 6,741,292 to Shen et al. ("Shen") further in view of U.S. Patent 6,618,442 to Chen et al. ("Chen") further in view of U.S. Patent 6,233,282 to Guerra.

Claims 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Bague in view of Shen further in view of Guerrero.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bague in view of Shen further in view of Guerrero further in view of U.S. Patent 6,542,182 to Chutorash.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bague in view of Shen further in view of Chen further in view of Guerrero further in view of Chutorash

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bague in view of Shen further in view of Chen further in view of Guerrero further in view of Brown further in view of Tindell.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bague in view of Shen further in view of Chen further in view of Guerrero further in view of Margulis further in view of Horiguchi.

Application No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006

Docket No.: 65783-0009

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bague in view of Shen further in view of Chen further in view of Guerrera further in view of Magulis further in view of Horiguchi further in view of Brown further in view of Tindell.

Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magulis in view of Tindell.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis in view of Tindell further in view of Edens.

Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Guerrera.

### **C. Independent Claim 1**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Tindell. Claim 1 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Tindell in view of Brown. (See the Office Action, Page 6). Moreover, in the interest of efficiency, because claim 1 was amended to include "an automobile," the rejection of original claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Tindell in view of Wakai is addressed in light of amended claim 1. (See the Office Action, Page 4).

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

a network interface for receiving said single audiovisual data stream from said compressor and transmitting in packets said audiovisual data stream on said digital data network, said at least one paired analog audio signal input and analog video signal input, said video decoder, said analog-to-digital converter, said compressor, said network interface, and said digital data network being located in an automobile.

(Emphasis added).

Tindell discloses a system and method for transferring video programs from a first location to a remote location using commercial telephone lines for the transfer. (Emphasis added; see Tindell, Abstract). The encoding scheme of Tindell is not taught in a mobile setting. (See Tindell, Col. 2, Lines 44-53). Indeed, Tindell does not teach or suggest a mobile system. Tindell is merely a land-based encoding and distribution system where encoding and distribution are separate functions performed at different times. (See Tindell, Col. 2, Lines 65-68). A source 24 provides audio and video that is encoded and sent to a mass storage device 22. (See Tindell,

Application No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006

Docket No.: 65783-0009

FIGS. 2 and 3). At a later time, programming is delivered to a remote location (e.g., a place such as a house) and is delivered by telephone network 12. (See Tindell; Fig. 1; Col. 2, Lines 44-47).

Wakai discloses an aircraft passenger entertainment system that distributes audio and video to passengers. (See Wakai, Abstract). Wakai discloses an aircraft playback system having headend servers 100 (typically associated with cable television) to provide audio and video playback. (See Wakai; FIG. 1; Col. 5, Lines 31-41). Wakai does not disclose the encoding configuration of Tindell on the aircraft.

Brown discloses a satellite-based video transmission system from a ground-based transmitter 26, 30 to a ground-based receiver 34. (See Brown; FIG. 1). Receiver 34 separates electronic program guide data from the input stream. (See Brown; Abstract). However, Brown does not teach or suggest any systems that include an automobile.

As amended, claim 1 contains elements neither taught nor suggested by Tindell, Wakai, or Brown. First, neither Tindell, Wakai, nor Brown teach or suggest an automobile. Second, neither Tindell, Wakai, nor Brown teach or suggest the alleged inputs, video decoder, analog-to-digital converter, compressor, network interface, and digital data network "being located in an automobile," as claim 1 recites.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art. Moreover, claims 2 – 6 depend from claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as claim 1, claims 2 – 6 are allowable over the cited prior art.

#### **D. Claim 3**

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly anticipated by Tindell in view of Wakai. Claim 3 has been amended to include new limitations.

Claim 3, as amended, recites in part:

wherein said at least one paired analog audio signal input and analog video signal input is accessible for use as an external input by at least one passenger of said automobile.

Application No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006

Docket No.: 65783-0009

The combination of Tindell and Wakai does not show that the claim elements are "accessible for use as an external input by at least one passenger of said automobile." For at least this reason, claim 3 is allowable over the cited prior art.

**E. Claim 5**

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tindell in view of Brown. Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as claim 1, claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 recites in part:

a second paired analog audio signal input and analog video signal input;  
a second video decoder connected to said second video signal input for decoding and digitizing a second video signal;  
a second analog-to-digital converter connected to said second audio signal input for digitizing a second audio signal; and  
a second compressor for receiving output from said second video decoder and said second analog-to-digital converter and combining and compressing said digitized second video signal and said digitized second audio signal into a second audiovisual data stream;  
wherein said network interface receives output from said first and second compressors, packetizes said first and second audiovisual data streams and transmits said first and second audiovisual data streams on said digital data network.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner may have transposed the references Brown and Tindell at the bottom of page 7 of the Office Action. In support of this assertion, Tindell discloses a single audio and video input. (See Tindell; FIG. 3). Brown should not be combined with Tindell for the same reasons recited in the arguments for claim 1. Moreover, Brown does not disclose the elements of claim 5 being located in an automobile.

Application No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006

Docket No.: 65783-0009

**F. Claim 7**

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Margulis in view of Horiguchi.

Claim 7, as amended, recites in part:

an interface for interfacing said output of said optical disc drive with said digital data network, said interface comprising:  
a video decoder connected to said output of said optical disc drive for receiving, decoding and digitizing said analog video signal;  
a compressor for receiving output from said video decoder and a digital audio signal from said optical disc drive, said compressor combining and compressing said digitized video signal and said audio signal into a single audiovisual data stream; and  
a network interface for receiving output from said compressor and transmitting said audiovisual data stream on said digital data network, said interface being located in an automobile.

(Emphasis added).

Neither Margulis nor Horiguchi disclose "said interface being located in an automobile." The interface includes a video decoder, a compressor, and a network interface. At least because neither Margulis nor Horiguchi disclose each and every limitation of claim 7, claim 7 is allowable over the prior art. Moreover, claims 8-14 depend from claim 7. Thus, for at least the same reasons as claim 7, claims 8-14 are in condition for allowance.

**G. Claim 12**

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Margulis in view of Horiguchi.

Claim 12, as amended, recites in part:

wherein said optical disc drive and said interface are enclosed in a common enclosure, said enclosure being installed in a vehicle.

(Emphasis added).

Neither Margulis nor Horiguchi disclose said enclosure being installed in a vehicle. For at least this reason, claim 12 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Application No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006

Docket No.: 65783-0009

#### H. Claim 13

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Margulis in view of Horiguchi, further in view of Brown, and further in view of Tindell. Claim 13 depends from claim 7. Thus, for at least the same reasons as claim 7, claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 13, as amended, recites in part:

wherein said network interface receives said second audiovisual data stream for transmission on said digital data network; and wherein said network interface packetizes said first and second audiovisual data streams and transmits said first and second audiovisual data streams on said digital data network.

(Emphasis added).

Neither Margulis, Horiguchi, Brown, nor Tindell teach or suggest “wherein said network interface packetizes said first and second audiovisual data streams and transmits said first and second audiovisual data streams on said digital data network” (as recited in claim 13) where “said interface being located in an automobile” (as recited in claim 7). (Emphasis added).

At least because Margulis, Horiguchi, Brown, and Tindell in combination do not teach or suggest data streams in an automobile, claim 13 is allowable over the cited prior art. Moreover, claim 14 depends from claims 7 and 13, either directly and indirectly. Thus, for at least the same reasons as claims 7 and 13, claim 14 is in condition for allowance.

#### I. Claim 15

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bague in view of Shen, further in view of Chen, and further in view of Guerra. Applicants have amended claim 15 to include the elements of claim 19. Thus, Applicants will address the rejection of claim 19 with claim 15. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bague in view of Shen, further in view of Chen, further in view of Guerrero, and further in view of Chutorash.

Application No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006

Docket No.: 65783-0009

Claim 15, as amended, recites in part:

said digital data network is a fiber optic network installed in an automobile [and]  
a micro-controller for receiving user commands for said digital video camera via said digital data network and controlling said digital video camera in accordance with said user commands.

(Emphasis added).

Neither Bague, Shen, Chen, Guerra, nor Chutorash teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 15, at least as emphasized above. In particular, Chutorash does not disclose fiber-optic networking to camera 10. (See Chutorash; FIG. 3, wired elements 36 and 34).

#### **J. Claim 24**

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Brown in view of Tindell.

Claim 24 recites in part:

decoding and digitizing an incoming analog video signal in an automobile;  
digitizing an incoming analog audio signal in an automobile;  
combining and compressing said digitized video signal and said digitized audio signal into a single audiovisual data stream in an automobile; and  
transmitting said audiovisual data stream in an automobile on said digital data network.

(Emphasis added).

As amended, claim 24 recites steps decoding, digitizing, combining, and transmitting as “in an automobile.” Neither Brown nor Tindell disclose at least the aforementioned steps performed “in an automobile.” Moreover, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Brown and Tindell should not be combined. For at least these reasons, claim 24 is allowable over the cited prior art. Moreover, claims 25-29 depend from claim 24. Thus, for at least the same reasons as claim 24, claims 25-29 are in condition for allowance.



Application No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006

Docket No.: 65783-0009

**K. Independent Claims 31, 37, 42, 45, and 48**

Claims 31 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis in view of Horiguchi and further in view of Tindell. Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Bague in view of Shen further in view of Guerrero. Claim 42 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magulis in view of Tindell. Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Guerrero.

Independent claims 31, 37, 42, 45, and 48, as amended, contain similar but not identical claim limitations including "remotely controlling" and "a fiber-optic network." For clarity, each of the pertinent sections of claims 31, 37, 42, 45, and 48 is listed below. However, the similarities include "remotely controlling" using "a fiber-optic network." These features are not taught or suggested by the prior art in the claimed structure and performing the claimed functions. Moreover, Chutorash does not disclose fiber-optic networking. (See Chutorash; FIG. 3, wired elements 36 and 34).

Claim 31, as amended, recites in part:

remotely controlling said optical disc drive by entering user commands which are transmitted to said optical disc drive via said network; and  
transmitting said audiovisual data stream on an automotive digital data network, wherein said digital data network is a fiber-optic network.

(Emphasis added).

Application No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006

Docket No.: 65783-0009

Claim 37, as amended, recites in part:

remotely controlling said video camera by transmitting user commands to said video camera via said digital data network, said digital data network being a fiber-optic network; and  
transmitting said audiovisual data stream over an automotive digital data network.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 42, as amended, recites in part:

means for remotely controlling said audiovisual source by transmitting user commands to said audiovisual source via said digital data network, said digital data network being a fiber-optic network;  
and  
means for transmitting said audiovisual data stream on said digital data network, wherein said digital data network is installed in an automobile.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 45, as amended, recites in part:

means for remotely controlling said means for reproducing audio or audiovisual data by transmitting user commands to said means for reproducing audio or audiovisual data via said digital data network, said digital data network being a fiber-optic network; and  
means for transmitting said audiovisual data stream on a digital data network, wherein said digital data network is installed in an automobile.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 48, as amended, recites in part:

means for remotely controlling said digital video camera by transmitting user commands to said digital video camera over a digital data network, said digital data network being a fiber-optic network;  
and  
means for transmitting said audiovisual data stream over [[a]] said digital data network, wherein said digital data network is installed in an automobile.

(Emphasis added).

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTERApplication No. 10/010,403  
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2006Docket No.: 65783-0009  
SEP 27 2006

In addition to the novel elements shown in the above independent claims above, many of the independent claims have dependent claims. Claims 32, 34, 36 depend from claim 31. Claims 38-40 depend from claim 37. Claim 44 depends from claim 42. Claim 47 depends from claim 45. Thus, for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, the dependent claims are also patentable.

### CONCLUSION

All rejections have been addressed. In view of the above, the presently pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. It is believed that any fees associated with the filing of this paper are identified in an accompanying transmittal. However, if any additional fees are required, they may be charged to Deposit Account 18-0013, under order number 65783-0009 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged against the aforementioned account.

Dated: September 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Glenn E. Forbis

Registration No.: 40,610

RADER, FISHMAN &amp; GRAUER PLLC

39533 Woodward Avenue

Suite 140

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304

(248) 594-0636

Attorney for Applicant